

Complete sets
Buschke
1-30-45
51797

THE RADICAL.

AUGUST, 1866.

THE RADICAL'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE BIBLE.

BY O. B. FROTHINGHAM.

WHEN we were at the Divinity School in Cambridge, twenty years ago, it was an accepted principle that the "Bible was to be read like any other book." The professor had the phrase continually on his lips, and we listened to it with entire acquiescence. Why not? The books of the Bible were written in dead languages, but so were the Dialogues of Plato, the dramas of Sophocles, the cantos of the Iliad. Words were words, and we had plentiful assistance by means of grammars and dictionaries, in finding out what the words meant. Words conveyed ideas; but the ideas were as plainly conveyed by these words as by other words which we were in the habit of reading. The principle was so simple as to be self-evident; but it involved a position that was fundamentally opposed to the faith of Christendom.

For in professing to read the Bible as we would read any other book, we actually, though perhaps unconsciously, classed it among other books; we placed it in the Catalogue of Literature; we ranked it among the productions of the human mind; we admitted the mind's capacity to understand it by natural effort; and in admitting that, we admitted the mind's competency to judge it by its own rational standard; we assumed that the requirements for a first interpretation of it were the requirements ordinarily demanded for the study of any author, namely, an acquaintance with the language in which the books were written, familiarity with the order of thoughts dealt with, and candor enough to recognize all the thoughts we found, exactly as we found them. The Bible claimed of its student "no peculiar state of mind," unless an acquaintance with its literary peculiarities might be taken to signify such a state of mind.

The professor saw all this and had the courage to be faithful to his principle. He dealt fairly with his text. If the language contained an "orthodox" sense he said so : if it contained a "heterodox" sense he said so : if the two senses were inconsistent with each other, he tried, perhaps a little harder than he would if a passage in Plato had been under discussion, to reconcile them ; — but if he could not honestly reconcile them, he said so, and let them stand as they were, unreconciled. Discrepancies in the history he regretfully allowed, and would make no unrighteous attempt to force repellant statements of fact into harmony. Weaknesses in argument, impertinencies in illustration, *non lequiturs* in deduction, slips in allusion, blunders in application and quotation, mis-fits of parallelism, infelicities of rhetoric, inconsistencies of opinion, he discerned, noted and felt no call to apologize for or annul. If Matthew taught that Jesus was the "Son of Man," and John that the Christ was the "Eternal Word," his duty was to make the fact known ; not to cover it up, or explain it away. To assume an immunity from error was to assume that the Bible was different from other books, and of course was not to be read like other books. To assume historical, doctrinal, ethical, or any other kind of consistency in advance of criticism, was to disarm criticism and take the books out of the department of Literature. To assume that there was a sense which dictionary and grammar did not disclose, and which trained intelligence could not extract, was to discredit grammar and dictionary, and warn intelligence off the field.

The rule often grated harshly against pre-existing reverences, as well as against preconceived ideas. That however could not be helped, a self-evident principle could not swerve from its line. There were passages that came into somewhat rude collision with the discoveries of modern science, but no rational power existing to prevent it, the collision must, however damaging, take place. Had the earliest documents of the Old Testament come to us bearing the name of Aratus or Hesiod, there would have been no reluctance to declare that their descriptions of the physical universe were childish in the eyes of actual knowledge. Why be deterred from saying so, by the mere fact that the books bear the name of Moses ? Does the circumstance of authorship alter the meaning of the text ? Or does it discharge from the duty of reading the text ? Do the "six days" become six epochs, or eons, simply because the phrase is found in "Genesis" instead of in the "Works and Days" ? Does the steel firmament with its windows for light, its openings for rain, and its solid frame work dividing the upper from the lower waters, become a mere figure of speech in the document "Ehohim," when it would be a literal state-

ment of belief in the "Theogony"? Why should a Hebrew cosmogony be turned into poetry, and a Greek cosmogony into ridicule, when the latter is no more wild than the former? The sacred books of the East abound in records of miracle, and as we read them, we smile at the fantastical stories as indicating an untrained intelligence and an unbridled fancy: why not smile at similar records in Exodus or Chronicles? Is Hebrew ignorance of natural laws, more respectable than Boodhist? Or do Hebrew accounts of a Miracle-governed world, imply a Deity who transcends Law: while other similar accounts imply no more than a populace that never suspected Law?

The Cambridge Professor did not think so. He called about him his learned helps, and what they revealed to him he frankly disclosed.

The accounts of the creation were ancient, and no sensibilities were much hurt by their free handling. The Old Testament might be read "like any other book" and welcome. A slight twitching of the nerves was manifest when the New Testament was taken up the same way. Did the apostles believe in the speedy end of the world? Did Jesus think that the Last Judgment, which was preliminary to the Millennial Rest, would take place during the life-time of men with whom he was then conversing? If Hermas or Clement, or the author of the "Gospel of Nicodemus" had told us so, we might have questioned the truth of their statement, but we should have admitted its import, saying, "The language means this and cannot mean anything else." Why not admit as much when the reporter is Matthew, or Luke, or Peter, or Paul, and the writings containing the statements are called the Gospels? What charm is there in the New Testament Greek to transform the sense it conveys, or to paralyze the mind that would fix a natural sense upon it?

But a permission to read the Bible "like any other book" with a view to finding exactly what it contains, is a permission to judge like any other book, and say whether what it contains is correct in fact, just in sentiment, right in principle. A foregone conclusion in regard to its wisdom is fatal to a fair construction of its text: and a fair construction of its text compels a verdict on its wisdom. If the Bible be the product of the human mind, the human mind must pronounce on its contents, as well as declare them. They who say the Bible is not to be read like other books, deny that it contains unworthy representations of deity, and work a powerful exegesis to expel all such unworthy representations from the text. They who say the Bible is to be read like other books, find such unworthy representations there, and charge the text with them. Dr. Cheever, an abolitionist, assum-

ing the infallibility of the Bible, strains every intellectual nerve, puts double lenses to his critical eye, drops the sharpest acids on the stubborn text, in order to expunge the last vestige of the virus of slavery. He would not deal so with Aristotle or Seneca. Theodore Parker, an abolitionist, scanning the page as he would scan the page of Antoninus or Epictetus, said: The Bible sanctions slavery. The conscience of mankind does not; the conscience of mankind must judge the Bible.

So in the department of Faith. One man, a Universalist, accepting the thoughts of Scripture, will exhaust great Neptune's seas in his effort to extinguish certain sulphurous proof texts of the Evangelicals; if they stood in Philo Judæus, he would not take the trouble to touch them with his wetted finger. Another man, a Universalist, quietly notes the fact that the Bible teaches eternal damnation or something like it, lays down the book and says: My reason reports the spiritual laws differently; the Bible is only a book, when all is said. A book is a product of the human mind, as it was when the book was written. The human mind now sees some things more truly than it did when this text was indited.

The Radical is not one-sided. He criticises with his whole mind, and not with any single faculty thereof. He believes in grammar and dictionary, but he has faith in the spiritual eye too; he uses sentiment and imagination. He can appreciate sublimity; beauty, loveliness, purity and truth as well as another; but he appreciates them only when he finds them. The grandeur of the Bible is not concealed from him; but he will have it render a fair account of itself at the bar of literary judgment. He admires the poetry of the Psalms, but not when they are inhuman; he concedes the majesty of Job, but pauses before its philosophy; he is struck by the nobility of the prophets, but their coarseness and narrowness do not escape him. Many portions of the Bible he cannot read at all: either because they are unintelligible, or because they are obsolete, or because they have no interest for modern men and women, or because they contain sentiments that are untrue. No portions of it does he read except as they convey in language venerable from its antiquity, or tender from its association, thoughts which modern speech might deliver quite as well, though less impressively. He reads it in his pulpit for the simple reason that he can glean from it more good pulpit reading than any other literature will furnish so conveniently, and because the inherent truth of its sentiment is waited for more reverentially as it falls from lips so long reputed especially holy. He takes a passage as a text for his sermon, but sometimes he takes it to show that it does not contain his truth.

The Radical ascribes no authority to the Bible over the minds which are on the same level with minds that produced it ; and no authority over lower minds save that moral supremacy which the elevated must always claim over the inferior. He imputes no inspiration to the Bible beyond the loftiness of the intelligence that created it ; such loftiness as may be found and recognized in all high literature. To its spiritual grandeur he doffs his bonnet, willingly, but no more willingly than to an equal grandeur in others ; and if the grandeur of others were equally familiar to him, he would experience no change of feeling in passing from its presence into theirs.

The Radical would gladly preserve the integrity of the Bible, but having confessed the supremacy of the literary laws, he acquiesces in their decision and calmly sees the sacred volumes disintegrate under analysis. The critic who reduces the Scripture to a heap of fragments, does not unsettle his faith. He knows that the literature of an age must not only be marked with the spirit of the age, and by the genius of the people of the age, but must bear traces of the experiences through which the time passed, the fashions, moods, caprices and policies of men, the accidents of fortune, the manipulations of scribes and editors, the revisions of priests, statesmen, men of letters, demagogues and prophets. He is certain that manuscripts must have been ascribed intentionally, or otherwise to wrong dates and wrong authors, that some books must have been composed in the interest of parties and cliques, that a seeming history may very well be a political pamphlet, that a narrative may disguise a philosophy, and a poem conceal a dogma. He is not surprised when the Pentateuch in its present form is removed a thousand years from the age of Moses, when the Psalms are distributed among many authors, when Job is taken up and declared to be an intellectual boulder that has strayed from its native land and lodged on Hebrew soil, when Matthew, Mark and Luke are pronounced unguine, and John's gospel is completely detached from the apostolic age. His interest in literary truth, and his enjoyment of literary art in its perfection, more than make amends for the pain he suffers at sight of the sundered unity and the broken charm of tradition. If his confidence in the Letter is dispelled, his confidence in the eye that sees through and beyond the Letter is strengthened. The continuity of the faith does not depend on the continuity of that particular record. On the contrary, it is the continuity of the Faith that dismembers the record.

In a word, the Radical meditates no dishonor to the Bible in dealing with it as he does. Dishonor the Bible by heartily adopting it among the grandest productions of the human mind ! Dishonor the

Bible by giving it a place in the great line of the world's Literature! Dishonor the Bible by taking it down from the niche where it has stood an object of idolatrous worship, and pouring its noble wine into the cup from which all men drink! Nothing is honored by being separated from human spirit and human life. And why should there be so much solicitude about dishonoring the Bible, and no more solicitude about dishonoring something else, all the rest of literature for instance, which by the side of the Bible is branded as "profane"; the human mind itself, maker of all Literatures, which has been coolly told all these generations, that the Bible was not only beyond its capacity of creation, but beyond its reach of comprehension? Is it not worth while, and will it not be wise at last, to transfer respect from the less to the greater, and let the creature shine with a reflected glory from the creator?

As for authority, it is taken from a single product of the human mind and attributed to all products of the same grade; thereby being multiplied and not diminished, extended, not destroyed. And as for Inspiration, instead of being denied, it is more emphatically and comprehensively affirmed; for it is held to belong to all writings of high spiritual character; nay, far more than that, it is held to be an attribute of all creative intellect in its moods of moral elevation.

Whether the Cambridge professor went so far as this, we do not know: probably not, for time is necessary commonly to develop even logical consequences. But those of his pupils who took him at his word, and read the Bible as they would read any other book, have been led to this point. If the Bible is to be read like any other book, it is to be judged like any other book: what is true in it is to be accepted because true, and what is untrue, as untrue is to be discarded; the errors are to be corrected; and the constituent elements themselves are to be subjected to analysis. In a word, if the Bible is to be read like any other book, it *is* like any other book.

Here the Radical might stop; but not to be considered flippant, shallow, conceited, and ignorant of what may be said on the other side, he will add a word or two more. The "Conservative," using the word in the popular sense, which is no sense at all, takes issue with the "Radical" at the outset, by saying that the Bible is not like any other book, and consequently is not to be read like any other book. Other books have all their meaning patent in their text: the Bible does not. The text may misrepresent, and even invert the inner meaning, it never reports it: at least it never reports it to the critical understanding, or the penetrative reason. That may investigate as it will, it gets at nothing behind the shell. That may rend and gnaw

and tear as it will, it can no more destroy the unity of the Bible than it could have created it. Your method, O Radical, is entirely false, your efforts futile, your labors quite thrown away. The Bible is a superhuman Book, and can be read only by eyes superhumanly opened, eyes of faith opened by the Church and anointed by prayer. To such eyes it appears what it really is, a consistent whole, complete in all the unities. Below the critic's dividing lines flows one broad stream of Truth from end to end, making one domain of chronicle, poem and prophecy, reconciling apparently hostile regions of development and running together seemingly sundered reaches of time. Thus the believer, standing at the heart of Scripture, smiles pityingly at the unbeliever nibbling away at its rind, and swallowing the moon in his water-pail.

When the ordinary Orthodox protestant talks in this way, the Radical says : Well, sir, show me this unity that you speak of, and I shall be satisfied. Convince me that all the eyes that claim to be eyes of Faith anointed by prayer, discern the same spiritual Truths in the Bible, and I will re-consider my method. But how many Orthodox sects are there, each of which professes to have the eye of faith anointed by prayer, but each discovering a fundamental Truth which the rest do not discover? The Bible seems to present as many different aspects to you who read it with the eyes of Faith, as it does to us, who read it with eyes of Science. Till you can demonstrate your advantage, you will hardly commend to us your method. Till you can show us something which is invulnerable to our weapons, and from which our studious apparatus recoils, we must be allowed to consider ourselves masters of the situation. So long as you cannot agree as to what you find, you must permit us to believe that we can find all there is, and you must not blame us if we read the Bible like any other book. In a word, till your doctrine of Unity is something more than an assumption, we cannot entertain it, and must submit that you beg the question under discussion. To refer us to the creed as containing the key to Bible interpretation is of no avail, is in fact an impertinence. It merely transfers the discussion to another field ; from the field of Scripture to that of Philosophy, from the dictionary to metaphysics. Who shall vouch for the Creed? Which Creed?

The Swedenborgian tries to lay the matter out more scientifically. To him the Bible is a book of symbols. The natural sense represents the spiritual, but does not present it. You must have the key to the spiritual sense before you can apprehend the natural. All your critical fumbling at the door will fail to touch the spring ; the bolt waits for the magical word ; and that word the doctrine of corres-

pondences alone can communicate. Take the "Dictionary of Correspondences" in place of Gesenius, and the Bible will be revealed to you as the book of Spiritual Wisdom, the "Word of God"; all superficial difficulties will be removed, all apparent discrepancies will be accounted for, all seeming contradictions will be reconciled. Rationalism will drop screw, file and bit, and be lost in admiration as profound as the Catholics, and more reasonable.

This is a perfectly fair position. The Radical waits to see it justified. But why does the Swedenborgian begin by omitting large portions of Scripture as having no spiritual sense whatever? Has he ever applied his principle to all the portions that he accepts? Has he done more than make partial studies here and there? Are those studies conducted in a rational, or in an ingeniously fanciful spirit? How is one to know that the sense indicated is the spiritual sense? Or how can we be certain that the special texts were designed to convey this special meaning, which certainly they would never suggest to the natural mind, and which the mind must put itself in a most unnatural frame to discover, looking head downwards as it were? And this Dictionary of Correspondences: on what authority are we to receive it? On what principles was it framed? How comprehensive is it? How generally applicable? How correct? What feats of Exegesis has it accomplished? How far has it unfolded a uniform deep spiritual significance in Old Testament or in New, or in any considerable portion of either? And to what extent is the significance it has unfolded self-evident to the reason?

Something more than Swedenborg's assertion is necessary to persuade us that by Man in the Scripture, is signified the supernatural principle; that cities represent the "interior of the natural mind"; that the belly stands for the "interior understanding"; that a "kid" means the "truth of the church," an "ox" a "truth of natural good," a "she ass" "the affection for such truth," and "swine" the "transcendentalists." This may be very cunning, puzzling, but it is by no means clear that it is worth the guessing. It would seem to be about as wise to read the Bible like any other book, as to read it in defiance of all the rules by which other books are read. A little wiser, perhaps, to get good plain useful truth out of it here and there, than to worry out spiritual senses by a process which looks more like puzzling than like sober insight.

Show me, cries the Radical, a spiritual sense in the Bible which evidences itself by its uniformity, its simplicity, its consistency and depth, its accordance with the laws of reason, its correspondence with the facts of life, its harmony with the soul's intuitions, and I will wel-

come it in place of my critical doubt : but as yet the existence of such a sense appears to me nothing more than a mystical dream.

The author of a remarkable book entitled "Philosophy as Absolute Science," claims to have done what Swedenborg, through want of a rational philosophy, failed to do. He professes to have found this deep sense of Scripture, and to be able to unfold it. To him the Bible speaks throughout one voice, not audible to the ear of the understanding, but articulate to the ear of Reason. Eye cannot read it in the letter ; ear cannot hear it in Hebrew or Greek speech ; mind of man, so far from comprehending it, does nothing but pervert and reverse it ; but to the spirit it is disclosed. The Bible, in his view, is a book of spiritual Philosophy ; it contains the Science of the Universe. He can justify every text ; he can restore the texts that criticism declares to be ungentine ; he can demonstrate the truth of that which criticism discards ; and nothing is impossible to him. He bids the critics do their worst, and laughs them to scorn. Their labors are worse than fruitless ; their triumphs are defeats ; their science is no science ; their conclusions are destructive. They are on the way to the absolutely false. While they are losing their way in the outer courts, he with his private key enters the holy of holies ; the secret place of Revelation.

The author does not perform this feat of extracting from the Bible a unanimous confession of his philosophy ; but the sole reason, he assures us, why he has not done so, is that it would take too much time. The task in itself would not be a hard one. Having tried the key in a great many locks, and never found it fail to shoot the bolt back, he is confident that all the doors of Exegesis will yield. And having discovered precisely the same contents in every chamber, it would be but an idle curiosity and a needless fatigue to run through all the galleries.

The interior of three or four chambers is opened for inspection. An appendix to the volume presents to the proselyte of the gate a few specimens of the spiritual interpretations ; the Lost Sheep, the Prodigal Son, the History of Job. The Radical reads and ponders. There surely, is the Philosophy, not precisely extracted from the text, but snugly laid into it, in a manner wonderful to consider, all effected with the aid of a revised, enlarged and corrected edition of that same "Dictionary of Correspondences" which we found on Swedenborg's table. The "hundred sheep" for instance, represent the "condition of the sentimental nature under the superintendence of the Catholic Church." The "Publican" is the Unitarian ; the "Sinner" is the Transcendentalist ; "the disciple of John the Baptist who preached

the crucifixion of Externalism. "Laying the sheep on the shoulder signifies the communication of spiritual life to the soul"; and so forth. All very good, but what objection can there be to our making the Bible words mean something else, and so getting another kind of Philosophy out of them? Who shall guarantee the scientific accuracy of the vocabulary? If the Philosophy has constructed the Dictionary — of course the Dictionary will "reveal" the Philosophy. Then who is to answer for the Philosophy? The Radical is sore bestead. He is first to accept the Philosophy, no slight matter of itself. He is next to whip the Philosophy into the Bible with help from the doctrine of Correspondences, — an undertaking requiring more skill in exegesis than any existing divinity school can boast. When he has done this he will indeed be ready to confess that the Bible is unlike any other book. He prudently waits till those who believe in these hidden, deep, impalpable senses, produce them, justify them, and force people to receive them on pain of being put down among the irrationalists.

The Radical therefore maintains his attitude: reads the Bible as he would read any other book; criticises it, judges it; uses it for instruction, reproof, and edification; but expects no superhuman wisdom from it, and will not call it the Word of God, or the Book in which the words of God are especially written.

FRAGMENTS.

GRASSHOPPERS are musical; but snails are dumb. The latter rejoice in being wet; and the former in being warm. Then the dew calls out the one race, and for this they come forth; but, on the contrary, the noonday sun awakens the others, and in this they sing. If therefore you would be a musical and harmonious person, whenever the soul is bedewed with wine at the drinking-parties, suffer her not to go forth and defile herself. But when in rational society she glows by the beams of reason, then command her to speak from inspiration, and utter the oracles of justice.

WHEN you avoid suffering yourself, seek not to impose on others. You avoid slavery, for instance; take care not to enslave. For if you can bear to exact slavery from others, you appear to have been yourself a slave. For vice has nothing in common with virtue, nor freedom with slavery. As a person in health would not wish to be attended by the sick, nor to have those who live with him in a state of sickness; so neither would a person who is free bear to be served by slaves, nor to have those who live with him in a state of slavery.

From "The Works of Epictetus."

DELUSION.

BY D. A. WASSON.

UPON the mountain summit, pierced with cold,
I could not credit summer's heat below ;
Warm yesterday, as some fine fable old,
Some mythus of the golden age, did show.
So on these peaks of matter, distant far
From Life—Itself, the Quickener of the all,
Our souls, so pressed with sense, deluded are,
And doubtingly their home, their right, recall.
Sweet in the bosom memories will teem
Of birth and bliss empyreal, but we smile,
We smile despair, then say, "'t is but a dream ;
Clay, clay is real, nor doth our thought 'beguile."
Courage, my soul ! Thy dream renew, renew !
The worlds are shadows ; spirit's dream is true.

THE RELIGIOUSNESS OF SPECULATIVE CULTURE.

BY GEORGE HOWISON.

"IT is the Spirit that quickeneth," said Jesus, "the Flesh profiteth nothing : the words that I speak unto you, they are *spirit*, and they are *life*." If there is any one truth to which the procedure of civilization has lent its infallible authority, it is that our physical existence, with all its appliances, is not true being, but only its means and plastic matter. Unconsciously, at least, mankind assents to the doctrine of the Divine Life. Nor, when the question rises into consciousness, can we ever doubt that eternal things alone are valid ; that time and space are but the soul's perishable scaffolding toward heaven ; that our abiding end is, to realize our inherent oneness with God.

But how? If we neglect the central thread of civilization, in which the motive inspiration is lodged, to consider only the multitude who crowd about it and make the characteristic mass of daily living, how feeble a comprehension of the great truth is at once exposed. On every side, the divine ordination reversed. House and land, traffic, arts, manners, governments, international comities, not the *means*, humbly working toward the knowledge, belief, discovery of truth ; toward the inspiration of the sentiment ; toward enthusiasm for Art, Philosophy, Religion : but the usurping *ends*, to which all spiritual culture is postponed,

or for which it must prostitute its heavenly graces. A practical education is held to be one that will build railways, command an army, keep accounts, doing the deed and not thinking its method. Throughout the churches, there is a prevailing notion that the culture of the intellect is hardly a part of the divine Vocation ; that it is a thing well enough, but except as it can be put to fixed uses, is not a duty ; that it may be the privilege of dreamers, but that practical Christians ought to devote their faith to the doings of the household, the shop, the state, the church. The question, too, amounts to a maxim : Which is of the greater importance, a cultivated intellect, or a sanctified heart ? Such is still the pervading infidelity toward the oneness of our spirits.

It would seem not out of place, therefore, to re-affirm our unity. Let us say then, that Faith has its threefold fruit in Knowledge, Love, and Doing, and that these Three are One ; that the Divine Life, which, in so far as it manifests itself in finite beings, is the unity of Faith and Works, can be truly operative only in the trinity by which the Works proceed. Hence it shall appear that it cannot be uttered in Religion alone, or the binding-back upon Faith of our threefold energy in knowledge, feeling, and will ; but that arising in Religion, it must proceed by rational thought toward the comprehension of the infinite Order ; so that the Sentiment, enlightened, may love and worship in spirit and in truth ; and the Will, inspired, may in the same truth build character and conduct, the family, the state, civilization : in one word, the Church, visible and invisible. If, then, we repeat the question : How shall we realize our inherent unity with God, it shall be answered, By comprehension of the infinite system of truth. Not without speculative culture, are either mankind or men sanctified. Philosophic thinking is thus one of the elemental forces in society and in each member of it. If it fail to exist, society and the individual alike perish away from their vital powers. It is written, " Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." At the foundation of Christianity, lies the doctrine that *our conformation to God advances only by the comprehension of His thought in its eternity of Beauty, Truth, and Good. Speculative culture is the method of the Divine Life.*

The positive argument for this doctrine may be outlined as follows : The fundamental postulate of existence is the Absolute Person ; that is, the self-conscious One. He whose I is discriminated against Itself alone ; not, as ours, against some other. But a Consciousness, thus self-determined, is at once a will, but infinite ; a thinking, but infinite ; an emotion, but infinite : at once Omnipotent

tence, Omniscience, Self-content. Life, then, is the career of the Thinking Spirit. In holy Trinity, He abideth in His eternity, infinite Ground of finite will ; goeth forth of His eternity, the creative Logos, infinite Ground of finite reason ; filleth His eternity, Spirit the Comforter, self-contained Joy in the order of His eternal creation, infinite Ground of finite desire. The finite existences are but the terminations, the definitions, the form-takings of His thought. He *in* us, and we *from* Him ; the Divine Life is simply the identification of God and humanity. Hence, as He createth eternally, and is thus infinite only in the personality of his eternal Reason, so only do we truly live as that Reason uttereth itself in us, and as we find in it content of desire, or will it into conduct, by incessantly proceeding in the comprehension of its order. As He is Three in One, so must we become one in knowledge, feeling, will ; and the method of this unity is Speculative Thought.

Out of this general argument, one might easily descend into details, and show how the entire movement of individual and social development, how the formal product of the same in institutions, is finally conditioned upon speculative thinking. But perhaps a more immediately effective exhibition of the truth will be gained, by assuming that speculation is rejected by the individual and by society, and showing how certainly both will, in that case, perish. One further affirmative thought we must however consider, before entering upon this negative procedure, in order that we may begin with a higher comprehension of what Speculation means.

It is somewhat widely admitted, even by those who speak contemptuously of the philosopher as a contemplative dreamer, that the 'Severe,' or by especial grace, the 'Practical,' sciences are quite indispensable to society and indeed even to trade. It is by such, notably forgotten that every science, even a Practical, is possible only by contemplation, and has been, as a matter of historic fact, the result of abstract speculation. Indeed, the comprehension, and hence the discovery and first application, of every science, is impossible except by speculation : the origin of every science being in the dialectic of universal and necessary concepts. Speculative thinking, thus pursues the Science of all the sciences ; or better, the absolute Science of Science itself. The Triune Person, thinking His universe, exists in an infinite system : speculative thinking, or Philosophy, is the research of the method in the system. Whoever, therefore, by his own direct insight knows even one moment in that method, — and in no otherwise can he *know* it — is by so far philosopher, or speculative thinker. Philosophy, Art, Civilization, are but one and the same

Truth, determining itself into different modes. The first, is the system proceeding by method. The second, is the system in its eternal unity. The third, is the system actualized in the union of its method and its totality. Artist, thus, only anticipates Philosopher. True Poet is true Prophet; for in him the speculative thought, sublimed into a rapidity hitherto swifter than consciousness, seizes the totality of its own method and fixes it in form, in which the steadfast thinker afterwards traces it in due order, and by a thought truly more divine; because he thus consciously attains the order of the infinite Reason, and provides that he shall hereafter out-poet the poet, celebrating with the higher inspiration which comprehension always brings, in numbers equal with the perfected civilization, the Spirit descending and ascending into and through mankind.

Every true thought, whether in science of Space and Time, in science of Nature, in science of Spirit, in Art, or in the framing of institutions, is a moment in the infinite scheme of speculation. What is good in the moment however, is good only by virtue of the system to which it belongs, and can be maintained, whether in the separate man or in mankind, only as the system itself is followed toward completion. When, therefore, we speak of Speculative Culture, we should mean the exercise and joy of all Truth, or Art, or Avocations, in so far as these arise in conscious thinking. Whatever is known, loved, or done in the comprehension of its truth at first hand, is an exercise of speculation. Thus, all spiritual culture is speculative; and the denial that speculation is essential to our true being, is equivalent to denying that Spirit is sovereign in the universe,—to asserting that it has an end beyond itself, and that this end is the material world.

Now let us look upon the negative side: what are the consequences of such a denial? Suppose we assume that, not Wisdom, but Matter of Fact is the principal thing; that thought is not its own end, but has a right only in virtue of the uses it can serve, the institutions it can promote? We hear a great deal about the Wisdom of the Hour,—how it consists mainly in managing affairs so as to secure an honorable competence, make home happy, and help others to do the same,—some such gospel it is which has wellnigh driven from the pulpit the profound speculative doctrines of the elder Christianity: what is the necessary result of private or public conduct directed by such teaching? It has been affirmed, and is now repeated, that the end is Spiritual Death, the wasting away of all our powers, whether of knowing, or of feeling, or of will.

Let us see, first, whether this is not true in regard to the Intellect.

Of knowing, there are two distinguishable stages, or modes: Sen-

suous, and supersensuous. First, we have knowledge, through our several senses, of this or that single material thing: a house, a man, a tree, a stretch of water, an expanse of sky, the shining sun. But in the second stage we discover that these, which at first appeared so simple, and each so sufficient for itself, are not only discriminable one from another, but often repeated in nature. Within this stage, there is, first, the discovery that in all things going under the same name there is an invariable something, which at first sight of the particular object we seem to recognize as known already, so that each new tree, or water-view, or human being merely repeats and varies an unvarying theme. Things are no longer merely this or that, here or there, but are embodied concepts. Next, we find that these concepts, which we cannot but think are eternal, however transitory the separate embodiments may be, are themselves the unities of other concepts, the variations of a higher theme. This is our elementary lesson in science, as distinguished from ordinary knowledge. All our developed science is nothing more than the recognition that nature is but an array of forms not isolated, but related, grouped according to necessary relation in the concepts embodied in the several forms. As we ascend from one scheme of truth to another, we at length learn that all truths constitute an infinite system, first, in their immaterial, eternal purity, and next, in their natural manifestation. From unities, through higher unities, we pass to absolute Unity; the multitude of individual existences are seen to constitute a universe, vital with one transcendent Theme. Thus what appeared to our eyes a simple body, has unveiled itself before our thinking as a wondrous complex into which have vanished the elements of the system of thought, — that system, the eternal procedure of the Thinking Person, and each single existence one stage in the infinite series of His self-determinations.

Such are the two great modes of knowing. It is evident that the second, the thinking of the system of unsensuous concepts, is identical with what has hitherto been called Speculation. To assume, then, that Speculation has no vital function in religious life, or that Matter of Fact is the sole field of action to be animated by the sentiment of worship, is to disallow the infinitude of supersensuous knowledge, and limit man to the finitude of the senses and the sensuous understanding.

Man, then, acting professedly with religious motive in outward occupations alone, in the sensuous understanding alone: — will he realize the Divine Life, or what will become of him and of any society that he may in this way establish? What will the end be to the intellect itself?

Briefly, — Defeat of civilization, barbarism, intellectual savageism.

For, in the last analysis, it is the limitation of knowledge to the realm of the senses, which separates the savage from the civilizing man. In the savage, brute Nature holds Spirit in abeyance ; in man civilizing, Spirit proceeds in a never ending subjugation and regeneration of Nature. The savage is an adult body, hiding an infantile soul. "The Flesh lusteth against the Spirit." Hence, the man who confounds his spiritual Vocation with his avocation, by assuming that his end is the sensuously practical, does by this confusion assume to all intents the intellectual position of the savage. If, by grace of the contagious civilization surrounding him, he be saved from the repulsive exterior of the savage, or enriched with a wider field in which his matter-of-fact understanding may plod, or confronted with a mirror of decency which frightens him from grossness and chases his unruly appetites into hiding places of craft, avarice, or hard dealing, let all this be granted ; it is no product of his elected function, but exists simply in spite of that. Not only so, but his assumption is the obstruction of civilization itself. Civilization is the Divine Life uttering itself in a society, in mankind. It is religion socialized. Here the Spirit subjugates the Flesh, according to the order by which the whole Creation proceeds. All social institutions arise out of a perpetual Regeneration, — out of a consciousness surely following the method of the divine Thought, and infallibly attaining its comprehension. To civilize, each human being must be veritably born anew. The thought abeyant in him, the intrinsic unity which he has with God, which he cannot dissolve by less than self-annihilation, must rise to the *beginning* of comprehending the immutable verities in which he lives. God, Truth, Beauty, Good, must descend into his present consciousness with such distinctness as to be his at first hand, — as to brook no delay, but he shall run after them with joy. Seeing thus that these alone have valid being, he thenceforth pursues their thought, rationalizes, gains comprehension of the divine system, loves, produces accordant conduct, frames the ever developing Christendom. In the movement of God's spiritual kingdom, nothing goes by rote, but all by insight. As no being is ever born from above, through having committed the doctrines to memory, but only by direct personal discovery and seeing face to face ; so the mere Practical Performer, satisfied with such wonders as he can work with his rules and routine, divides himself from the civilizing intelligence, and abstracts the working of its grace in himself and in all whom he may support or mislead in a like folly. Hence, too, the fact that the savage and barbarian tone of intellect, tamed a little for the show, but savage and

barbarian still, infests the high places of civilization itself. It rides in our chariots, flaunts in our parlors, giggles, stares and simpers in our social assemblies and on our promenades. What a pantomimist it is! No form of civilization, however refined, that it does not ape. If fashion dictates, it attends upon lectures in science, or reads at works in philosophy. As a common thing, it is to be found at the musical assemblies, is a prominent patron of poets, painters and sculptors, and even prays in our churches. When a criminal breaks loose, we can all understand that we have a savage among us. Truly, crime in civilized communities has a significance, but we are slow to read it. It is only the old story of the wolf in sheep's clothing. It ought to teach us that, by sheer force of imitation, the form of civilization may exist where its spirit does not; that he who has not learned to *think*, and by thought, instead of by conventions, to regulate his conduct, departs from the savage intelligence in form alone, and not in substance.

The three co-ordinate forms in which civilization symbolizes and tests its procedure, are Religion, Philosophy and Art. As civilization exists only in their co-ordination, development and comprehension, so do they become actual, objective, and *for us*, in the process of civilization, and not otherwise. Accordingly, it is in the conduct of mere practicalism with respect to these, that its intellectual impotence is most apparent. The man who lives in it, may no doubt conduct a business, build a locomotive according to pattern, or even manage affairs, and that too with sufficient ability; but we should hardly expect him to paint the Sistine Madonna, carve Laöcoon or build the dome of Saint Peter's; still less, to discover a new planet, or the law of gravitation. To look for Zoroasters in him, or Holy Scriptures from him, would be simple blasphemy. In presence of either Art, Philosophy or Religion, the devotees of the Practical behave as creatures of sense, and not of reason. They are either dull, hard, unsympathetic, or caught away in a flurry of volatile sensations.

Now, every work of Art is the embodiment of a theme which has a fathomable order and unity of thought. It can be known and enjoyed *as Art*, only in the conscious recognition of that theme. Otherwise, it titillates the senses merely. And to many, doubtless this sensuous pleasing is the only experience either in Sculpture, Painting or Music. To such, the *Dying Gladiator* contains nothing loftier than the anguish of a dying body. How many look upon Raphael's *Transfiguration*, and come away saying — How ugly he has made Christ's hands!

How few hear the struggling soul crying to God through the score of Beethoven, or can recognize it when you tell them it is there. Poetry itself, with the plain utterance of words, is to many nothing more than rhythmic sound. Or, if its separate thoughts be clearly taken, and its fancies excite a pleasurable glow, how seldom does their unity rise into the mind of the reader — the unity by which alone they constitute a Poem, a veritable Creation, perfect image of the unity of God's creative thought.

Philosophy and Religion fare still worse. Little can it avail to affect intelligence by conning over this or that 'Valuable Treatise on Mental Science,' when speculation, which alone is equal to its own comprehension, is repudiated as unmeaning. Philosophy, is thus, simply impossible. Without it, there comes the narrow mind. And Religion is therefore supplanted by bigotry, superstition, and finally indifference — the only real infidelity. For we really have faith, and worship, exactly in proportion as we comprehend truth. Thus, the history of religion runs all the way from Fetichism up to philosophic Christianity. In the being who does not think them, all worship, and all reverence for so-called doctrines, are merely superstition. A doctrine *is* such, only in virtue of being found in thought and received in conviction. How, then, is faith to have way in an intellect restricted in its exercise to mere matters of fact? God, Immortality, Sin, Atonement, Regeneration, the Resurrection from the Dead — how shall these become doctrines to the soul that requires as its ground of certainty, positive sight, hearing, touch? — that has attained the folly of believing the transitory to be the only reality? The evidence of the senses, and the whole method thereof, taken alone, goes counter to every one of these truths that wholly transcend the senses. All that nature says of God is — Fate; of Immortality — Death, Transition; of Sin, Atonement, Regeneration, Resurrection — not one word.

This dying-out of the spiritual powers is not merely a logical sequence of the principle assumed. The sequence writes itself legibly in facts. The air is full of a voluble sentimentalism over arts, knowledges, and rituals. We are gone mad with Diffusion of Intelligence. There is endless celebration of being well-informed; extensive visitation of circulating libraries, and galleries of Art; immeasurable playing upon the piano and going to concerts, with some sedulous memorizing of the great composers. But youth hastens to break away from the restraints which lead to thought, from the sober studies which contain its rudiments. It hurries to be rich, to marry and maintain an establishment. Why — it does not pause to in-

quire
over
ened
venti
Su
has a
TH
know
guish
is th
syste
satio
long
and
imm
the c
into
ence
tion
ity,
Si
the
purs
As v
reac
and
usin
com
limi
lead
mos
and
and
this
so a
vote
gra
of
abs
com
life
pla

quire. It has been the custom ; that is sufficient. Imitation lords it over the reason. Conviction, imagination, worship, are not awakened, but perish in sleep beneath the all-subduing spell of convention.

Such are the effects of the Practical Theory upon the intellect. It has a similar experience with the Feelings.

The feelings, or the soul emotive, are the bond between the soul knowing and the soul willing. Accordingly, as there are two distinguishable modes in knowing, there are also two in feeling. The first is the excitation from sensuous knowing ; the second is that from the system-seeking thought. Feelings of the first mode, we will call Sensations ; those of the second, Sentiments. To the former class, belong all the merely self-regarding impulses, the passions of the flesh, and the instinctive fondnesses. To the latter, all the unselfish and immortal aspirations ; for the Sentiments are the finite projection of the divine self-content, the yearning to arise out of our mere self-hood into our possible unity with God. Hunger, the craving for the presence of the beloved, the desire of gain, the pride of life, are Sensations ; joy in beauty, joy in truth and its pursuit, patriotism, humanity, devotion, are Sentiments.

Since the habit of the feelings is thus determined by the habit of the intellect, it is manifest that devoting the life to merely practical pursuits must end in an exclusively sensational experience of feeling. As we can run the descending scale of intellection, from its highest reach in the civilized community to its lowest settling in the savage, and find that just in proportion as it deals with mere matters of fact, using thought only for its ministrations to the general comfort, the community approaches the savage condition ; so, within the visible limits of civilization, we can trace a like descending, from its thinking leaders to the half-conscious multitude who wear its guises, but are in most spiritual experiences essentially barbarian. And in community and individual alike, the dormant reason carries with it a dormant and dying emotion. As we descend from community to community, this is evident enough ; within the civilized limits, it is doubtless not so apparent, by virtue of the contagion of fashion. Indeed, the devotees of refined materialism appear quite ardent in cultivating the graces of life. But let us not deceive ourselves ; there is the distance of the whole heaven between sentiment and sentimentalism. The absence of all feeling that has its source in comprehension, is not incompatible with the apparition of the most refined forms of civilized life. The sensations perpetually simulate the sentiments. Pride displaces the honor which it feigns ; fondness mimics love, and is mis-

taken for it ; vanity of fashion vaunts itself as rapture for beauty ; self-conceit counterfeits the love of truth ; sanctimony supplants worship ; all deceive actor and beholder alike. Here, indeed, we strike upon the dark currents in unthinking life. What with its idols of Respectability, Fashion and Convention, it reduces the emotional experience of communities to a dreadful dissimulation. A very witch's draught of Mephistopheles, it drowns the spirit in the torrent of the senses, and causes mere nervous exhilaration to seem ravishment with the heavenly ideals. The sentiment due to Art, is travestied by a bedizened and chattering oblation to fashion in the crowded assembly ; or, in private intercourse, evaporates in platitudes inspired by the seeing eye, and not by the rapt heart. Music hastens to be popular ; men and women listen to it, but hear in it no human or heavenly voice ; only a mystic, sweet confusion of sounds. Yet they thrill to it, weep at it ; surely this is sentiment ! Is it sentiment, then, in the tiny mouse, that dies in ecstasy at the plaintive notes of the violin ? These are only the sensuous effects of music. All forms of Art have these in common. In no form do we attain *sentiment*, until we in some degree comprehend the truth which constitutes the theme of the form. As for the sentiment of Philosophy, we need not mistake though we hear never so much prating about the love of truth. We may be certain, once for all, that this highest of sentiments dawns in those alone who heartily strive to *know* the truth. Shall we suppose that we have attained it, if we can still yield ourselves with pliant gracility to enact the polished lies of society, the studied concealment of the real opinion, in the conceit that by so doing we are paying homage to the beauty in courtesy ? In religion, if we reject the thinking which gives it reach and meaning, we may and do attend upon manifold ceremonials ; but the Christian symbols are in so far a dead letter, the Christian formulary rolls over us, never awakening one vision of true God's presence, nor one thrill of that joyful rising out of humiliation, which is the essence of all worship that is sentiment. Still less, is it felt that all true being is utterance of worship—true art, true thought, true love—and indeed the only real utterance. In exchange for these noble possibilities, we have, at best, a dull content with the comforts of daily living ; more probably, an uneasy reaching after nervous excitement amid the confusions of Vanity Fair ; at worst, underneath the polished proprieties of convention, the corruption of bondage to sensual lusts. There may, to be sure, seem to remain a generosity—but like the eagle's ; a benignity—but like the dog's ; a valor—but like the horse's. Thus we sum the remnant of what was man's heart ; a range of impulses common to us and the

brutes. In truth, "who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth? All go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again. Yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast: for all is vanity."

But the evil does not end here. As the intellect does not attain its profoundest insight except by the co-operation of the sentiment; and as neither sentiment nor thought can experience full being except by the co-operation of the holy will; so the greatest spiritual disasters to either, are not experienced except through the re-action of the deteriorated will. What, then, does practicalism do for the Will?

The soul as will, in so far as concerns its function of creating conduct, is exercised only in view of foregone knowing and feeling. It puts, or fails to put, a thought into conduct, accordingly as it comprehends the thought, and as its feeling is in concord, or not, with the real character of the thought. There is in it the reserved possibility of acting the thought in defiance of either truth, or feeling, or both; but this is not its ordinary experience. Usually, right is done when the feeling is in harmony with the knowledge of the truth; wrong, when the feeling is discordant. In general, the feeling due to a thought, or the valuation of it according to its place in the universal scheme, is educed in the soul by a comprehension of the thought and not otherwise. It follows hence, that the habit of conduct will be made and measured by the kind and degree of exercise which the intellect attains. The limitation of the intellect to its sensuous mode, to the exclusion of all knowledge concerning the true being of the universe, must therefore limit the conduct to such forms and degrees of goodness as are attainable through the sensuous understanding. As the truths of this never go beyond our mere selfhood, and never excite any feeling nobler than the sensations, the highest ground of conduct which they can afford, is that of self-interest. To restrict the conduct to a scheme of self-interest, is therefore the first legitimate effect of practicalism upon the will.

Now, to fathom the real meaning of this result, we must penetrate the nature of our being far enough to see that the limitation in question amounts to the obstruction of both the inception and the evolution of the Divine Life, so far as the will has a function in either.

Our total being is the unity of two moments, called by the Christian Fathers, Faith and Works. All finite being is truly the self-determination of the Absolute Being, the self-forming of God's eternal

thinking or Logos in finitude of time and space. Hence, there is in every such being, first, that outgoing and return upon itself of the divine consciousness which is essential to His infinity ; and, secondly, this Consciousness is also *formed*, in a triune evolution of reason, emotion, and will. "In Him we live." Our consciousness, therefore, resolves itself into, first, Faith, or the undertow of God's thinking setting through us and returning evermore into Himself, — the assurance of all truth ; and, second, Works, (*actus, ἐνέργεια*.) or the procedure of our being in knowledge, feeling, and doing. Now the Divine Life consists in this : that Faith, or God in the consciousness, shall be so united with the Works, and operant in them, that their evolution shall be in perfect co-ordination, and in perfect actualization of their infinite Grounds in the triune Lord. This operant union must have, then, both an inception and a development ; and both are conditioned upon our action in will. For the soul as will is not merely the creator of conduct, but the very essence and germinal dot of our finite being. It is the life-giving determination of the Father, in which we are established a personal identity ; for as He is neither creating Reason, nor self-contained Spirit, except as He is self-determining Father, (*αὐτοθεός*,) so are we neither a knowing nor a feeling but in virtue of being a will. The function of the will in the Divine Life, is therefore two-fold. First, as inmost self-essence it is to experience the regenerative inception of that life, and thence to be evolved into that sub-conscious *disposition* which constitutes the basis of spiritual development. Secondly, its separate, conscious choices, which determine conduct and re-act into character, are to be regulated according to truth and right.

But upon what conditions are these functions exercised ? In the state of nature, our will is in a sort of anarchy. Not yet flowing from the sub-conscious determination, its superficial, conscious choices have no unity from within, but follow the whim of the moment, or the season, tossed hither and thither from without. In this state, self-interest is all that preserves to it an identity, and the truths of self-interest constitute its highest motive. Out of this mere nature, it may arise through regeneration into life eternal, or lapse into spiritual death. In the former case, through the discipline of morality, it gradually frees itself from the infantile subjection to impulse, and is evolved into the permanent disposition which renders holiness spontaneous. In the latter, it descends through the successive stages of self-delight and selfishness and pure self-will, settling into a disposition to evil. That it is at all possible for us to pass from the reign of nature, where Faith is in abeyance, to the freedom of the spirit,

where Faith is operant in accordance with the truth, is due to the perfect unity of our being. Our conscious identity, although its will is the fount of all its *operative* existence, yet is valid only by its final identification of knowing, feeling, and will as one and the same content, namely, a self or person. Hence, in any the least instant, in the very infinitesimal beginning, we *have being* only in virtue of the co-action of our Knowing-feeling-will. It is thus provided that, to our inmost essence in will itself, the Truth-thinking God shall in some instant be so profoundly unveiled, even by the mediation of His lowest manifestation, as to inspire the source of our action with longing after His truth thenceforth. This is regeneration. Except by such an inspiration of the truth, it cannot by any means arise. The guiding ray of the cosmic beauty must have penetrated the secret of our being, and led us into at least one moment's vision of its method, henceforth ever to be sought. From this moment, *I ought* is lord within us, forever transfiguring itself into *I love*. And truth being thus the condition of the holy disposition even in its inception, much more is it so in the evolution of the same. Truth, too, which transcends and annihilates the whole scheme of self-interest. *Renounce thyself!* cries the redeeming Spirit, *God alone is worthy of thy love, and thou must bring Him forth into thy deed in the fulness of His thought, which forever invites thee!* And if the disposition, then again still more is the conduct dependent upon finding the truth. The perfectly true deed is done, only when it is discovered; and the deed which embodies our endeavor after the perfect one, comes not without the sincere searching for the perfect knowledge. The disposition alone, leaves us but creatures of ethics; if we would ascend into morality, and thence into love, we must attain a comprehension of perfect conduct, by sounding the meaning and method of our own being, and indeed of Life itself.

Impotent, then, for promoting either function of our will in the Divine Life, is any scheme of conduct whose end is merely self-interest. Yet such is the end of practicalism, and such is therefore its weakness. Neither can it aid us toward the new birth into a holy disposition, nor light us by one ray toward the conduct in which the disposition shall have its fitting manifestation. If it lends no light, still less does it offer invitation. Rather, it diverts and obstructs our will. Ending in self-interest, its direct effect is, at best, to leave the will in the state of nature. But in this, there can be no long continuance. The lapse from self-interest to self-delight is easy, and usually speedy. From self-delight to selfishness, the path inclines broadening; and beneath, is the abyss of wild self-will. With the descent,

the sentiments are buried deeper under nature, while the sensations spring and flourish. In the dying of the one, the other lives and riots. In the turbulent depths of the selfish or wilful spirit, the sensations rage unceasingly, and we behold the incongruous spectacle of a soul, at the moment of its fiercest revolt against restraint, emptied of its very essence in will, and put in bonds to passion. Here, the possibilities of heroism are suspended by cowardice, cruelty, lust, and sordid meanness. Out of nature we have descended into hell. The Faith once adequate in nature, has sunk into the infrequent whisper of the stifled conscience. From these depths, God alone can raise us, and not without his flaming terrors. These also shall, perhaps, be unavailing until the being is shaken asunder and dissolved by the awful force of crime.

If these results of decay, in intellect, in feeling, in will, — that is, in Spiritual Power itself — are proper to a life expended in deeds alone, they should bring with them most significant lessons. That they follow logically, has been shown: and also, that they record themselves in the visible experience of the world around us. That they leave their mark in each one of us, moreover, in so far as we partake in the utilitarian temper, or fail of exercise in meditative thought, no one who is acquainted with himself can for a moment question.

If the time permitted, it would be easy to illustrate the truth here considered, from the widest generalizations upon the tribal gradations of mankind, from the laws of decay in the dead communities of the ancient world, and from the history of all living in cities, whether present or past. Let us hope, however, that it has already been made clear that, beyond all question, Religion is dependent upon Philosophy. That it is the saving grace of thinking which sustains in us all whatever real virtue we contain; that it is the actual faith in the supersensuous world, the actual, if unacknowledged, working out of *some* truths each for ourselves, that redeems us from mere materialism, in whatever low degree we have attained such redemption; that it is the dearth of thinking, which keeps us, so far as we are kept, in the sterility of mere avocation, or in the shallow soil of conventionalism. What we do not sufficiently feel in this day, what we most seriously need to feel, is that holiness means perfection of being. We are not conveniently jointed together, so that this or that part which we may undervalue, can be removed at pleasure. Our being is one and indivisible. Deeds, avocations, all our physical uses, become beautiful and holy, so soon as they are subordinated to our spiritual unity. It is this unity, whose birth and process are in thought, which consti-

tutes Religion, by working through the deeds. We need the inspiration of the truth, that what God is working in His perfect Church, the infallible Civilization, must be reproduced in each of us, if we are to experience the Divine Life in its fulness. The elements of this are not exhausted in disposition and conduct alone. As thought builds the wonder of Christendom, which has no meaning or manifestation apart from its Religion, its Art, its Science, informing, moulding and illumining its politics and institutions, so must we build ourselves into its unity by means of thought, and cannot in any other way. Thus, our whole co-operative energy shall become divine. We shall work the real miracle, transforming brute nature into the fluent interpreter of spirit. The divorce between Religion and Culture shall be annulled in the comprehension that the Absolute Good is one with the Absolute Truth and Beauty.

A SUMMER MORNING HOUR WITH NATURE.

BY AUGUSTA COOPER KIMBALL.

THE Night has gathered up her moonlit fringes,
And curtains grey,
And orient gates, that move on silver hinges,
Let in the Day.

The morning sun his golden eye-lash raises
O'er eastern hills;
The happy summer bird, with matin praises
The thicket fills.

And Nature's dress, with softly tinted roses,
And lilies wrought,
Through all its varied unity discloses
God's perfect thought.

Great Nature! hand in hand with her I travel
Adown the mead,
And half her precious mysteries unravel,
Her scripture read.

And while the soft wind lifts her tinted pages,
And turns them o'er,
My heart goes back to one in by-gone ages
Who loved her lore,

And symbols used, of harvest field, and fountain,
And breezy air ;
Who sought the sacred silence of the mountain,
For secret prayer.

Oh drop, my soul, the burden that oppresses,
And cares that rule,
That I may prove the whispering wildernesses,
Heaven's vestibule !

For I can hear, despite material warden
And earthly locks,
A still small voice ; and know that through his garden
The Father walks.

The fragrant lips of dewy flowers that glisten
Along the sward,
Are whispering to my spirit as I listen,
"It is the Lord."

And forest monarchs tell by reverent gesture
And solemn sigh,
That the veiled splendor of his awful vesture
Is passing by.

The billows witness Him. No more they darkle,
But leap to lave
The silent marching feet, that leave a sparkle
Along the wave.

And sweet aromas, fresher and intenser,
The gales refine ;
The odor floating from the lily's censer,
Is breath divine.

Thus Nature, Heaven's voice, yields precious witness,
And large reply,
To him who comes to her with inward fitness
Of harmony.

PROFESSIONAL RELIGIOUS CONVERSATION.

BY J. C. LEARNED.

WITH new wisdom and enlightenment there come new usages. Each age has an aspect of its own with which it is born into the world, and which distinguishes it from all other ages. The new times are different from the old. Great changes have crept imperceptibly upon us, or they have sprung up spontaneously in obedience to the law of development or later growth. Whether we accept the "development theory" or not, he is blind who sees no transformations. The times are not as when we were children; and they differ still more from the times when our fathers were children.

I think no one will deny this; indeed men commonly assert it,—on every hand we hear it re-iterated with striking emphasis. And perhaps nowhere are the changes which time effects more manifest than in the views men have of religion, and of religious observances; at least if the mind or thought has remained untrammelled and free—if no artificial and arbitrary checks have been imposed to impede or stifle it. And even there it often breaks over barriers and takes perforce that liberty which is denied it.

But can we properly speak of these changes as progress? Taking a general survey of religious opinion and observance to-day, is it an advance upon past periods? As an illustration of many points let us consider the one point of religious conversation, as growing out of the pastoral relation.

Some can remember, but all have heard it related, how the minister of former times moved among his flock. A man of grave and solemn exterior; with a well-shaven face, not easily relaxing into smiles; whose very garments—save perhaps a white cravat—were of sombre colors, and of a certain dignified and established fashion, that permitted no variability or change; having a mode of speech not unfrequently marked by a hollow or nasal twang, but which allowed no 'idle words'; in personal intercourse at most intimate only with the deacons of his parish, really unrestrained, and familiar with none; a man who seemed to desire to impress upon those about him, that his business was that of saving souls—and a melancholy business too—which was engaged in, as a sort of fearful but necessary work which God had 'called' or 'elected' certain men from the foundation of the world to undertake—a kind of cross or discipline to be borne in this world, but which should somehow be greatly compensated in the next, probably in part by a sight of those souls which they had been instrumental in saving from the pains of eternal fire.

The minister of the olden time was, and was expected to be, an exceptional man, distinguished in many ways from all others. He did little or nothing in the natural way. He was supposed to have constant dealings with the great mysteries of Life, Death and Eternity; and have a certain knowledge of these subjects which common people could not attain to; to

have a certain authority to speak on them not granted to average mortals — even if he did not hold the very keys of Heaven and of Hell. In the presence of the minister the people could not help looking upon their common life as altogether worldly. He brought into their homes an atmosphere that made not only their luxuries, but even their comforts reproach them. If they had any joy or pleasure, his presence immediately made them question if it were not inconsistent with their eternal good. If it was natural it was for that very reason carnal, and they almost expected to hear his voice denouncing all the pleasant things of this world, as the temptation of the devil.

He did not join in, he could not sympathize with mere amusement ; were not death, and sin, and retribution staring men in the face ? Therefore he made the world seem an unfit place, and this life an untimely hour for any pleasure-seeking or merriment. And so the minister became scarcely less a terror and a mystery than the themes with which he dealt. The two were always associated together, until in many an instance the man who was to be the people's spiritual guide was little else than an inscrutable "man in black" or a walking spectre.

His concern, they said, was with *spiritual things* — he lived not for worldly ends. To the young he seemed especially forbidding in his mien — formal, unapproachable, gloomy ; to the children awful as the Great Mogul who might have commanded them all to be eaten up in a trice, and none dare gainsay. It would have been degrading to the dignity of a minister of the olden times to condescend to talk baby-talk with babies, to chuck the chins of the little ones, or trot them on his knee ; and they grew up to look upon him as a social iceberg, which no place or climate of humanity could melt. How often have we been told how the children ran away and hid themselves when they learned that the minister was coming, and the young folks turned pale, and found some excuse to go out, if the minister entered their homes !

Such things were common in the days when a great deal was looked for from religious conversations ; when it was thought pre-eminently proper for the minister to converse upon religious matters from house to house. At certain intervals he regarded it a part of his duty, formally to ascertain the exact religious condition of the families composing his parish, and as it was a matter of professional business, he went about it in a business way, — much as a physician would examine a patient afflicted with bodily ails. Except that whereas the physician of the body, relied for cure chiefly upon the pills, powders, and solutions which he carried in his chest ; the doctor of souls depended greatly upon what he should effect by his own *looks and words*. Moreover the doctor of physic usually had for his object to make his patient hopeful and well, while the whole plan of the doctor of souls was to convince *his* patient that he was sick — *sick unto death* — ruined, doomed and LOST.

And it was only when the poor beleaguered soul gave up and admitted its utter worthlessness and despair, that this spiritual adviser would allow the

faint
edge
a per
least
himse
as to
the h
And
long
a duty
advan
and w
the w
street
to a
invol
most
came
perso
as a
mind
so lea
faith.
or ne
suspe
he w
havin
man
in the
Of
admi
I hav
auste
of me
alone
town
mean
the k
As
and
itual
objec
detai
were
more
bette

Professional Religious Conversation. 477

faintest gleam of hope to shine upon it. A man was required to acknowledge and to believe that he was the vilest and most abandoned of sinners — a perfect and loathsome wretch — before it was admitted that there was the least purity or saving grace in him. A man must be damned, and damn *himself*, before he could be saved! Indeed the old Hopkinsons went so far as to require that a man should be willing to be damned *eternally*, before the hope of redemption could be safely offered.

And when the minister came to talk on these grave subjects he made no long preliminary, and took no round-about way to introduce them. It was a duty to be done, and — however painful it might be to him or others — he advanced to it directly and boldly. He regarded it as God's requisition, and woe was upon him if he shrank from the issue. So that many a time the wife or mother at her domestic duties, the daughter casually met on the street, the mechanic at his bench, or the farmer in the fields, was brought to a stand by the minister's inquiry after *the state of the heart*: inquiries involving the deepest mysteries of earth and heaven; involving too, the most sacred, tender and secret instincts of the soul! Every calamity that came upon state or community, every strange or inexplicable event, every personal misfortune, every death-bed and funeral was liable to be selected as a providential opportunity for religious conversation — for turning the mind of this one or that, upon questions that would be sure to baffle it, and so lead the way to the solemn and authoritative enforcement of the saving faith. In many places it was quite well understood that the minister seldom or never called except upon religious errands, so that it was customary to suspend all worldly work as much as though Sunday had come, so long as he was in the house. If the children or young folks could not be found — having escaped from his freezing and cadaverous presence — before this man of God departed the Bible was read, and prayer was offered for them in the presence of whoever remained.

Of course there have always been — and it seems to me it is to be gladly admitted — great exceptions to the class I have described, and the picture I have drawn; — men more genial and flexible, somewhat of the world, less austere. But there have been worse instances which remain well attested, of men solemn as the grave, as if the weight of two worlds rested on them alone, and besides arbitrary as iron, popes and dictators in the parishes or towns where they lived, seeming to act upon the conviction that if other means failed, the right faith could be established, and souls compelled into the kingdom by sheer violence and force.

As the times have changed, however, the old faiths have been modified and new methods prevail in the place of the old. We still believe in spiritual guides and helps, and our churches have increased. The *general* object of the ministry we may perhaps say is still unchanged: but the details and lesser requisitions of the pastoral office are no longer what they were. And we believe that the deep religious instinct of the people, are more respected and better treated than in the olden times. For they are better understood. We believe the deepest emotions, the most sacred feel-

ings, and experiences of the soul are not for common conversation or every day topic, except to the most kindred spirits; much less for public and noisy profession. For we see that it is only when men are unduly wrought upon by artificial means, and a great straining after effect, that they can be induced to make a public parade of those most delicate and retiring qualities, those naturally sweet and modest feelings that lie deep and hidden in the breast, which by their very hiding and diffidence, sanctify the character and the life, asking no approval but that of a pure conscience, no witness but the eye of God, but which, dragged to exhibition, are like crumpled violets or flowers from which the perfume has departed. For there is no soul that does not abhor to be laid bare to the gaze of men.

All remember the terrible and uncalled for conditions laid upon Godiva by the Earl of Coventry, as it is told in ancient story. But it seems to me that the condition which we have often seen laid upon human souls, is no less terrible and uncalled for. When I hear a pure and modest soul called upon to run the gauntlet of a mixed and staring assembly, or make public display of its superior beauty and most *sacred* feeling, I wonder that all people do not feel the cruelty of the demand, and shut their ears and turn away their faces as the people of old Coventry did: sure also that in listening to these wordy professions, the religious sense of many is blunted, and that they lose their power to discriminate between the true and the false in their own bosoms.

It is because we approximate more and more to views like these that professional religious conversations grow less common among us. It is not directly, it is only incidentally that we can approach those topics. Oftentimes the more persons aim at them, the more they fail. The religious word that is great and to benefit either him who speaks or him who hears, must arise spontaneously; if it is artificially effected it is not genuine, and perishes. Two young pious persons meeting at an evening party, and not wishing to be too worldly, one said, "what shall we converse about?" Said the other, "Let us speak of Sunday Schools." But it is not by *malice prepense* that we can always slay a worldly thought, and cause a spiritual one to spring up in its place. Recently one who was foremost in the getting up and management of a revival in a certain New Hampshire town, quartered himself upon a young man for a talk concerning the condition and safety of his soul. They had never spoken together on the subject before, yet the first question of the revivalist was "What do you think of God, Hell, and the Devil!" Abrupt, and even blasphemous, as such an assault seems, it was made by no illiterate or uneducated man in the common use of those words, nor was it made upon one guilty of any immorality, or greater sin than that of leaning towards a Liberal Faith. Surely the revivalist was ignorant of the very alphabet of human nature, but fanaticism knows no bounds. Not thus do men find the way to the finest chords of sacred emotion. What is the influence of such speech to that of a silent life! The speech that is always betraying a plan but indifferently succeeds!

Professional Religious Conversation. 479

One spoke great praise of another when he said "We have often talked together on religious questions that concerned us deeply, and he influenced me very much, but I never knew or thought he was going to speak with me about them, — I could never tell where we left our secular topic for our religious one, but they blended together or grew out of each other so that they seemed wedded together by natural bonds. This natural and easy transition showed how near that man's religion lay to his daily life; a true religion only *underlies* it."

The deepest emotions which we experience concerning divine things when they have their greatest control over us, are pained at the very thought of publicity, and instead of making us indiscriminately talkative, oftener make us utterly dumb; even as the deepest grief we know is not loud and clamorous, but is wordless, and sometimes tearless. Therefore when our friends are bowed by the burden of a great sorrow we dread to mention it. Uncertain that our words can afford the slightest relief, we are careful to make them few. So, it is with great diffidence that we invade the realm of the sacred instincts. We may jar and harm where we would gladly help and harmonize. We believe the true religious feeling is rather meditative than talkative. Even so pious, a man as the celebrated author of the "Spirit of Prayer" shrank from contact with, and discouraged those who sought to enter with him upon religious themes. And Montaigne said as a general truth, what is especially applicable when the subject is religious experience, that "*silence* and modesty are most advantageous qualities in conversation." The minister, then, of our day instead of going from house to house to force an expression upon these questions, rather helps the people by hints to work them out for themselves; or stands accessible and ready if any one *asks* assistance to say what in his power lies, to give strength and comfort to the earnest soul. For in spiritual matters it is only when the want is felt that the word can heal.

Does any one still say that the ancient days were better than these? Would any rather go back a generation than to live in this present? There may be here and there one sighing for the good old times; but we can only be sorry for those who thus turn their faces backward. For we are sure that such have outlived their hope. All that is joyous and cheerful in life has gone out for them: one can only read sadness and disappointment in their countenances.

But let not many of us feel thus, lest in our lack of faith some evil thing befall us; lest in failing to appreciate the good gifts of our own times, we become unworthy of them and they be taken from us. Let us be sure that God smiles upon these latter times, yea, and even more propitiously than upon any past. No doubt he makes his universe better every day, for we believe in progress. We refuse to believe that everything is sliding backward to destruction or to chaos. We believe therefore that the great changes which we see written upon human society are for the best. We believe that God himself is working in and through them. We believe that we have gained rather than lost — gained greatly — in the change of method

incident to religious observances, and religious communion. And we anticipate other changes, and we shall welcome those also if by any means we can keep up with the times, out of which they will have their birth. What changes there will be we cannot pre-determine; the new age institutes its own.

The true minister of to-day is not a priest, but a citizen. He is distinguished by no garb of office, nor is he thought more of for assuming a clerical stateliness or dignity. We hope he is no longer pointed out to the children as a special object of awe and terror, to frighten them into good behavior. Indeed, we suppose he is now generally thought of — not as a spectre, or as it has been phrased “a machine to grind out pious words” at all times on demand — but as made of flesh and blood, even as other men, with somewhat similar feelings and similar needs: by no means perfect in all his ways, or final authority in all his words; but by God's grace seeking to realize the responsibility and duty of his position, as one who desires to help his fellow men in those things wherein we all need help, and in view of which we have churches and religious ordinances, whereat we all assemble for worship and communion, and our mutual edification.

REFORMATORY INSTITUTIONS IN MASSACHUSETTS, AND THE

PRESENT STATE OF THE LAWS RELATING TO THEM.

BY F. B. SANBORN.

[Read at the Reform School Conference, June 5, 1866.]

MR. PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE CONFERENCE:

The Committee which invited this assemblage of benevolent and public spirited persons to meet in this city, the capital of Massachusetts, deemed it fitting that you should be welcomed, at your coming, by the Governor of the Commonwealth — an agreeable duty, which His Excellency deeply regrets that his previous engagements prevent him from performing. They also desired that some statement of the number and character of our Reformatories should be laid before you, previous to your visits to any of our Institutions, and that the general course and present condition of our legislation on this subject should be indicated, that you might have the means of judging how fully our actual establishments carry out the spirit of our laws.

Having been requested to undertake this task, I shall ask your indulgence while I devote a half hour to the points which I have specified.

There are two great classes of Reformatories in all countries which have yet established them, *Private* and *Public* Institutions; the former being controlled and supported by private benevolence, and the latter by public

officers and revenues. But it is evident that there may be as many classes of Public Reformatories as there are public bodies in the community ; and since we have in New England three well defined civil organizations — the *State*, the *County*, and the *Municipality*, (Town or City) — we may, and actually do find Reformatories supported by each of these public bodies. So that, besides Private Reformatories, like the Farm School, on Thompson's Island, we have Municipal Reformatories like the Boston House of Reformation, on Deer Island, and the Lowell Reform School, County Reformatories in embryo, and State Reformatories. Of the latter we have three, the State Reform School for Boys at Westborough ; the State Industrial School for Girls at Lancaster ; and the School Ships, both now lying in our harbor, but of which one, the Massachusetts, is soon to be transferred to New Bedford.

The oldest of our Reformatories, strictly speaking, is the Boston House of Reformation, which was authorized by the Legislature in 1826, and opened in June, 1827. This establishment was modelled after the New York House of Refuge, which had been opened about two years earlier. It is entirely under the management of the City Government, and for some years past has been controlled by the Board of Directors for Public Institutions. It receives both boys and girls, has received in all 2,826 pupils, contains now about 200 pupils, and is located on Deer Island, about four miles down our harbor. Its inmates are at present almost all truants, arrested under the various truant laws of the Commonwealth.

The Boston Asylum and Farm School, which occupies a position intermediate between a Reformatory and an Orphan Asylum, was incorporated in 1833, and opened on its present basis in 1835. It is strictly a private establishment, has never been assisted by the State, and does not wish to be. It owns Thompson's Island, in Dorchester Bay, about four miles southward along our coast, and contains now about ninety boys.

The State Reform School at Westborough is an offshoot of the Farm School, having been founded by General Theodore Lyman, who was for many years a manager of the Farm School. It was established, however, by the State, in 1847, was opened in 1848, and has since been almost entirely supported from the State Treasury. The number of boys admitted here has been 3,333 ; the present number is 312 ; they are employed on the farm, which is large, and partly in mechanical labor.

In 1854, the State established a similar School for Girls at Lancaster, which was opened in 1856. In this establishment, however, the Family System was instituted from the beginning, whereas it has only prevailed in part at Westborough since 1860.

The Industrial School at Lancaster has received about 500 pupils ; the present number is 154. It is entirely supported from the State Treasury, and, like the Westborough School, is under the management of seven Trustees, appointed by the Governor and Council.

In 1859, in consequence partly of the burning down of a portion of the buildings at Westborough, the State established what was then called the "Nautical Branch of the State Reform School," on board the School Ship

Massachusetts, for older boys, and for such as might choose a seaman's life. This establishment, which is now almost entirely unconnected with the Westborough School, contains at present about 220 boys, on board two ships — the *George M. Barnard* having been added to the *Massachusetts* during the last year. The whole number of boys admitted here has been 1143, of whom between one and two hundred had previously been at Westborough, and were transferred from there.

We have, therefore, *four* large public Reformatories in Massachusetts, containing at the present time nearly 900 children in all, 695 boys and 183 girls.

We have *one* large private Reformatory, if I may give that name to the Farm School, containing about ninety boys. The legislation under which these five establishments have grown up, dates back for at least forty years.

Much earlier than this date, however, there were orphan asylums established, and these, under various names, and approximating by almost imperceptible gradations towards Reformatories, are now very numerous. Exactly how many there are in the State no one can say, for new ones are continually springing up. In the second Report of the Board of Charter, however, mention is made of thirteen such establishments, which is probably not more than half the actual number. These are all private institutions, making no regular report to the public authorities, so that it is not easy to collect their statistics. One or two of them contain a large number of children, but generally speaking they are small, containing, perhaps, at the present time, about 800 children in the aggregate.

If we return now to the consideration of public institutions on a smaller scale than the four already mentioned, we find a number of Truant Schools, under divers names, in the large towns and cities of the Commonwealth. These are perhaps a dozen in number; they have been established, for the most part, under the Truant Law of 1862, and are yet in the first stage of experiment. But this cannot be said of the Lowell Reform School — the largest of the class — which was opened in 1851, shortly after the State Reform School was organized, and has done much good in checking vice among the young in Lowell.

Another class of public Reformatories in Massachusetts has been designated by law, but not yet established. I refer to County Houses of Reformation, which, by Chapter 208 of 1865, the County Commissioners of the several counties are allowed to provide. I have lately written to these officers throughout the State, to ascertain what steps have been taken to carry out this provision of law, and I hope that we may hear from some of them at our Conference.

Turning now to the course of legislation in regard to neglected and vicious children, to the laws under which these numerous establishments have grown up, we shall find that those laws themselves indicate a gradual awakening of the community to a sense of its duty towards these unhappy members of it.

The early provision made in Massachusetts for general instruction in learning and morality is well known, and was for a time, no doubt, sufficient

to keep the class of ignorant and depraved children quite small. But as our population increased, and the disturbing elements of new races and alien religions were introduced, poverty became more permanent, and juvenile vice more common. At first, the powers granted to overseers of the poor in our towns and cities were so exercised as to provide for neglected children, and when these were inadequate, individual charity carried on the work. But soon societies were incorporated to manage this increasing task, and, from 1800 to 1850 these societies multiplied and were of great service, as they still are. The interference of the magistrates, however, which was recognized as necessary in 1826, when the Boston House of Reformation was incorporated, became the settled policy of Massachusetts about 1850; and the power of committing neglected and vicious children to institutions supported by the public revenue, has been fully exercised by all our judges for nearly twenty years. And this power has been gradually extended, either by recognizing new causes of commitment, or by increasing the means of receiving sentenced children, until now it is very wide.

During the session of the General Court, which has just closed, a new step has been taken in this matter. We have three State Almshouses, at which there is an average of 600 school children the year round — most of them belonging to the class from which our young vagrants and criminals come. These children are about half orphans, or else deserted by parents who are unworthy to take charge of them. Of the other half, the majority would probably lead better lives if they could be at once separated from their parents, whose influence, either in a positive or negative way, is bad.

Now these 600 children have heretofore been styled and treated as paupers. Their schools, however good they might be, were pauper schools, their associates were paupers, their dress, their food, their whole government was that of an almshouse. The wise and humane Legislature of 1866 saw the evil of this, and opened the way for a change. By the "State Primary School Act," passed about a month ago, it is enacted that so many of these children as can be separated from the mass of pauperism in our almshouses, shall be gathered in a special school, where they shall cease to be called paupers, and where the influences around them shall be of a higher order. This school is located at Monson, near Springfield; it will gather together, when full, perhaps 500 children, from four to sixteen years old. These children will be carefully taught, and, as soon as it can well be done, will be provided with places in good families in the central and western parts of the State.

Besides the Act just mentioned, two other Acts relating to poor children were passed by the Legislature which recently adjourned. The first of these, (Chapter 273, 1866,) relates to the employment of children in manufacturing establishments, and was framed in accordance with the spirit, though not in the precise terms of the recommendation of the Labor Commission of 1865. The Act provides that an amount of schooling double that heretofore required by law, or six months in a year, shall be given to all children employed in factories, both before they enter and while they

continue to work there, and it fixes the age at which a child can lawfully be employed in a factory, at ten years ; while between ten and fourteen years, eight hours is a day's work. Moreover, it entrusts the execution of this law not to the School Committees of the cities and towns alone, but to the State Constabulary, which has shown itself a very efficient police force. The defect of the former law on this subject was that it was very often disregarded, and prosecutions under it were seldom brought by school committees, who, being local officers, were under the influence of the sentiment in their locality. The State Constables will have no such reason for neglecting violation of the law, and it is hoped that much good will result from it, in keeping poor children at school, and away from demoralizing influences. Whether the *direct* result will be to diminish juvenile crime may be doubted, but it must have that effect ultimately, if well enforced.

The last Act to which I shall refer is one "concerning the care and education of neglected children," (Chapter 283, 1866.)

The following is the Act referred to ; it differs from the well known Truant Law of 1862, (Chap. 207,) in several particulars, among which may be noted :

1. It is optional and not obligatory, so far as the towns are concerned.
2. It is more general in its scope, not being confined to truants.
3. It allows a sentence *during minority*, instead of for two years.
4. It repeals the Truant Law of 1862, in the city of Boston.

Be it enacted, &c., as follows :

SECT. 1. Each of the several cities and towns in this Commonwealth is hereby authorized and empowered to make all needful provisions and arrangements concerning children under sixteen years of age, who, by reason of the neglect, crime, drunkenness or other vices of parents, or from orphanage, are suffered to be growing up without salutary parental control and education, or in circumstances exposing them to lead idle and dissolute lives ; and may also make all such by-laws and ordinances respecting such children, as shall be deemed most conducive to their welfare and the good order of such city or town ; *provided*, that said by-laws and ordinances shall be approved by the Supreme Judicial Court, or any two justices thereof, and shall not be repugnant to the laws of the Commonwealth.

SECT. 2. The mayor and aldermen of cities and the selectmen of towns availing themselves of the provisions of this Act shall severally appoint suitable persons to make complaints in case of violations of such ordinances or by-laws as may be adopted, who alone shall be authorized to make complaints under the authority of this Act.

SECT. 3. When it shall be proved to any judge of the Superior Court, or judge or justice of a Municipal or Police Court, or to any trial justice, that any child under sixteen years of age, by reason of orphanage or of the neglect, crime, drunkenness or other vice of parents, is growing up without education or salutary control, and in circumstances exposing said child to an idle and dissolute life, any judge or justice aforesaid, shall have power to order said child to such institution of instruction or other place that may be assigned for the purpose, as provided in this Act, by the authorities of the city or town in which such child may reside, for such term of time as said judge or justice may deem expedient, not extending beyond the age of twenty-one years for males, or eighteen years for females, to be there kept, educated and cared for according to law.

SECT. 4. Whenever it shall be satisfactorily proved that the parents of

any child committed under the provisions of this Act, shall have reformed and are leading orderly and industrious lives, and are in a condition to exercise salutary parental control over their children, and to provide them with proper education and employment; or whenever said parents being dead, any person may offer to make suitable provision for the care, nurture and education of such child as will conduce to the public welfare, and will give satisfactory security for the performance of the same, then the directors, trustees, overseers or other board having charge of the institution to which such child may be committed, may discharge said child to the parents or to the party making provision for the care of the child as aforesaid.

SECT. 5. Chapter two hundred and seven of the Acts of the year eighteen hundred and sixty-two, shall not apply to, nor have effect within the city of Boston, after the passage of this Act. [Approved May 29, 1866.]

This is a supplement to existing laws on the subject of Truancy, and of itself, perhaps, will produce no new result. But if the public attention awakened by the Conference and by other agencies, shall be turned to the subject, both this and the previous law will be so executed as to improve the condition of poor children, and to lessen juvenile crime.

Such, members of the Conference, has been the latest legislation in this Commonwealth on the subjects which we have met to discuss. Other States and communities have gone as far in some directions, and, very likely, in all. But no community can go too far, either in enacting such laws or in developing a public sentiment which will insist on their faithful execution. In this matter we are not simply protecting society against the attacks of an army of young criminals — we are not legislating to protect property and morals alone — but we are discharging a most sacred trust. The duty which we owe to our own children every parent must feel; but the duty which we owe to these unfortunate children of whom we speak, is no less imperative. Let me quote the language of Miss Mary Carpenter, of England — a lady who has done more than any living person to ameliorate the condition of neglected children — and who discussed the subject very ably in a paper read before the International Philanthropic Congress in 1862. Says Miss Carpenter:

"By the order of Providence, the young and immature being is placed under the guidance of parents, bound by every motive, and by the laws of man as well as the instinct of nature, to nurture and protect him. But if deprived of this protection, from whatever cause, it is the duty of the State, and of society, to take charge of the child, to be to it *in loco parentis*. And further, every child born in a Christian and civilized country, has a right to demand such protection, such help. He has a right to expect a better condition than if left neglected in a savage and heathen country; there the wild instincts of nature would have awakened compassion, and secured care in untutored heathens. Here where, if he grows to manhood, he must take his place in a civilized community, and will be compelled to obey its laws, he has a right to expect such education as will enable him, when arrived at maturity, to take his proper station in society. Such we hold to be the distinct duty of the State, such the rights of the neglected child. And if the State neglects this duty, then, instead of being sustained and strengthened by good citizens, she will ever have that something rotten in her social condition which will undermine her resources; and she must annually spend

thousands or millions, earned by honest industry, in the cure of disease she has herself caused.

"Let it be assumed, then, that every child who is without the guardianship appointed for it by the Creator — proper parental care — has a *right* to claim from the State such tutelage ; and that it is the duty of the State to assume the control and education of such children.

"To some this will seem a self-evident proposition, almost unnecessary to state — some will dispute it. I will, however, leave it to others to argue it ; it can be proved by reference to the highest authorities ; I must not now delay to do so.

"There is, however, another and most important element in our social condition which must not be passed by — the Christian element. We know well the verdict of Christianity in this matter. This care for children, whom no ties of blood have united to us, is the direct result of the teachings of the Saviour ; and no feature of a Christian nation more forcibly distinguishes it from others, than institutions where children who are neglected, scorned, and degraded in social position are received as in a home, educated and prepared for that state of life in which it shall please God to place them. The State and a Christian society must help each other in this work ; neither can do it effectively without the other. The State, having alone the power, must supply the authority, and such pecuniary means as are needed for the maintenance of the child ; the benevolent, the Christians, must give the loving labor and such supplementary contributions as are needed."

It would be difficult to make a better statement than Miss Carpenter has here given of the respective duty of the State and of individuals. In Massachusetts, and, I believe, in several other States of our Union, the task of the legislator has been better performed than that of the Christian community. Our laws, though far from perfect, are now more than sufficient for the work which we give them to do. It is we ourselves — it is the churches and the community of New England and New York, and the great West, that are not accomplishing the work given us to do. We, the citizens of the country, uniting in benevolent activity according to our means and opportunities, have the power to make our beneficent laws fertile in good results, and then to amend still further the laws themselves.

TWO PHOTOGRAPHS.

BY MONCURE D. CONWAY.

I HAVE been gazing with curiosity upon two photographs. One of these shows me a man of about fifty years, though the photograph shows this only under a magnifier, with a strong German forehead, small sharp eyes, thin lips, active chin (as the physiognomists say,) and a well-shaped form. He is smartly dressed, and sits looking intently at a *prima-donna*, in costume, who sits on the other side of the table. The man is Bismarck ; the opera-singer is Pauline Lucca. Why these should be in the same picture I know not ; but there is in my eyes something particularly striking in her being near Count Bismarck. The expression of the man's

face is precisely as if a kind of vain admiration for an opera-singer represented his entire extent of affectional and unpolitical nature. For the rest, he is a man who would be found, if anatomized, to have a secret treaty under his bump of amativeness, and a bundle of diplomatic dispatches in the place usually occupied by a heart. So at least reports that one reporter that will not lie — the sun. I have found recently, in London, a brief biographical notice of Bismarck, which I condense here. According to this account, the Count was born at Schœnhausen, on the Elbe, in 1814, and claims lineal decent from some ancient chief of a powerful Slavonic tribe. A learned German in London has however assured me that this claim is unfounded, and that Bismarck belongs to the secondary aristocracy of Prussia, which may account for his desire to out-tory the Tories. He studied at the Universities of Gottingen, Berlin and Greifswald, became volunteer in the infantry, was made member of the Diet of Saxony in 1846, and of the general Diet in the following year. The singular vivacity of his language, and his irrepressible tendency to start some bold and audacious paradox, which he then maintained with remarkable vigor and ability, quickly fixed the attention of political people. One of the theories which he expounded in this fashion was to the effect that large cities were centres of all that was mischievous and wrong — that they were obnoxious in the highest degree to the general welfare of nations, and ought to be destroyed as hotbeds of evil principles. The revolution of 1848 had the effect of completely confirming M. Bismarck in his absolute tendencies. The King had attentively watched the career of the young statesman whose political views were so eminently acceptable to him, and in 1851 M. Bismarck was invited to enter the diplomatic service. His talents were, it would appear, quite understood from the first; for soon afterward, the post of Prussian representative in Frankfurt was vacant, it was certain that difficult and delicate questions would then require to be discussed and settled, and Bismarck was appointed. Whether anything occurred here to wound his susceptibilities or irritate his dogmatic and overbearing temper cannot be actually ascertained; but undoubtedly from that period may be dated his constant manifestations of enmity towards Austria. He never lost any opportunity of declaring that Austria was not only the hereditary foe of Prussia, but was a common source of danger to Germany, and disquiet and uneasiness to the whole of Europe. Though, in point of fact, Austria always has been, and in the nature of things always must be, a conservative Power rather than otherwise, sluggish in commencing war, and more often condemned to defend herself than to attack others, by continual reiteration these accusations received a certain amount of credit. The Prussian liberals did indeed dislike M. Bismarck, but not with that bitterness with which a man is said to regard the enemies in his own household. At any rate, they detested Austria more: and when in 1862 M. Bismarck was sent to Vienna, and contributed largely to the exclusion of Austria from the Zollverein, organizing a systematic opposition to Count Rechberg, the hatred of liberal and constitutional principles which has always distinguished the Prussian Minister was apparently forgiven if not forgotten. In 1858 a remarkable brochure appeared, entitled,

"La Prusse et la Question Italienne," in which an alliance of Prussia, Russia, and France was advocated as the sure means of establishing a German unity which should be at once safe and honorable: of course it was to be under the guardian care of Prussia. There is hardly any doubt that M. Bismarck, if he did not actually write this pamphlet, inspired it, and superintended its introduction into the world; and this fact gives a light whereby to read his character, for it would seem that he is not only despotic in action, but that, contrary to the generally accepted idea, he has patience, theory and daring, and can "bide his time." In 1859, M. Bismarck was sent as ambassador to St. Petersburg, and remained for three years at the Court of the Czar. Whatever influence he may have acquired there will probably remain barren except under certain circumstances which are not very likely to arise. When M. Bismarck left St. Petersburg he was for about six months ambassador at Paris, and was summoned hence to Berlin to officiate in the double capacity of Minister of Foreign Affairs and Master of the King's Household. This was in 1862. At that time Prussia was a prey to internal conflict, carried on, however, with a phlegmatic, calm, and cumberous slowness which were both incomprehensible and vexatious to English politicians. The Lower Chamber steadily resisted the military reorganization, which tended to weaken the Landwehr as much as it would strengthen the standing army. That in this matter the members were guided by a wise instinct is shown by the reluctance of the Landwehr to commence hostilities in the present unjust quarrel, whereas M. Bismarck's strength lies in the readiness of professional soldiers to engage in any quarrel. The budget then was condemned by an immense majority, but the Upper House approved of it, and the session was abruptly closed by royal mandate. M. Bismarck continued in power, and his administration was distinguished by extreme rigor towards the press. In 1863, an address was presented by the deputies to the King, in which the Minister was straitly charged with having violated the Constitution. Soon after the Polish revolution broke out, and contributed not a little to the difficulties of the Government. A secret treaty was concluded with Russia on the 8th of February in 1863, and as soon as the Chamber was cognizant of the fact, a vote of censure was passed against the Ministry. M. Bismarck was nothing daunted thereby, and his conduct at that time may indicate what we are to expect of him generally. He became more than ever inflexible and headstrong. His apparent success in the Danish question did not, however, alter the hostile attitude of the Liberal party towards him, and in June, 1865, a storm broke in which constitutional rights and principles were effectually trampled on by the audacious Minister.

Such are the chief points in the career of the man who at the age of fifty gained from his countrymen the name of *Der Mann von Blut und eisen* (the man of blood and iron,) and who, though he has received from Louis Napoleon the Grand Cross of the Legion of Honor, has had his name trampled in the boulevards of Paris into a new verb, "bismarquer"—signifying to cheat at cards. Such is the man on whom German mothers are invoking the vengeance of God this day, for tearing their husbands, sons

and br
to be t
so long
is unde
Tur
whom
exile o
spirits
I have
being r
Rollin,
was in
trait I
against
it woul
to see h
who at
which
where l
oar in a
markab
only for
left Eng
himself
tures a
about tr
where A
ceived a
cles, wh
occasion
professe
when h
trees, a
swiftly v
sors had
farms, t
Englan
his hanc
alas! it
more th
house, c
poor we
named b
wandere
lieve, af
so soon
youth pa

and brothers away to fight for no better cause than that Bismarck desires to be the Napoleon I.'s avator in Europe. He has the strength of a giant so long as the poor weak King, whom he never permits out of his presence, is under his fatal influence; and he shrinks not from using it like a giant.

Turning to the other photograph, I recognize the face of a young man whom I once met at the house of Karl Blind, the scholar, statesman and exile of Germany, whose home in London is the home also of many noble spirits whom despotism has cast out and England welcomed. Sometimes I have felt that with Freiligrath, Kinkel, and others, the real Germany was being modelled around the table of Karl Blind, where also Mazzini, Ledru Rollin, Louis Blanc and others also are brothers. It was when Garibaldi was in London that I saw, without remarking much, the youth whose portrait I now speak of—the portrait of Ferdinand Blind, who hurled his life against the “man of blood and iron.” A good-looking, bright German youth it would seem, made for happiness instead of for tragedy. One would look to see him whirling finely in a gymnasium. And indeed Ferdinand Blind, who at the age of twenty-two made his attack on the life of Count Bismarck, which ended in his own death, passed nearly all of his life in England, where he was educated, winning the first prize as a rifleman, and the silver cup in a regatta. He was the step-son of Karl Blind, whose family are remarkable for intellectual gifts and culture. But Ferdinand seemed anxious only for a healthy country life, and seemed almost too unambitious. He left England with the intent of studying agriculture in Germany, and located himself on a farm near Tubingen, where he at the same time attended lectures at the university. He was eighteen when he went there to live; about two and a half years afterward he went to an academy at Hohenheim where Agricultural Science is taught. Here his mind seems to have received a singularly fine growth; he studied earnestly and wrote several articles, which were well received. He became the chief spokesman on many occasions of his fellow-students, and received various testimonials from professors for capacity and conduct. He wrote to his friends in London when he left this academy, in the most cheerful strain—of nature, of fruit-trees, and his graftings, on the farm to which he had now returned. How swiftly was the sunshine of this young life to be overclouded! The professors had persuaded him to make a tour through Germany and visit different farms, that he might extend his agricultural knowledge before returning to England. He started off in the highest spirits from among friends, waving his handkerchief, and entering into a land full of the glory of spring. But, alas! it is sometimes in the power of one fell spirit to wither up the spring more than many frosts. He found as he went from town to town, house to house, on every side, Germany in mourning. The rich found no joy, the poor wet their hardly-earned bread with their tears. And each of these named but one name as the cause of this sorrow—BISMARCK! “As I wandered,” so ran the youth's letters to a dear friend, a letter opened, I believe, after his death, “through the blooming fields of Germany, that were so soon to be crushed under the iron heel of war, and saw the numbers of youth pass by that were to lose their lives for the selfish aims of a few, the

thought came quite spontaneously to punish the cause of so much evil, even if it were at the sacrifice of my own life. Only after I was firmly decided did I become calmer. At ten o'clock at night I left Carlsbad for Toplitz, whence I should be able to proceed by train. Heavy clouds, from which the lightnings flashed, lay piled up on the horizon, and pressed down heavily upon the mountain-peaks. The rain poured in torrents. In the mountains there was a large fire which lit up the heavens." Arrived at Berlin he concludes his letter thus: "I assure you that I do not rush into this undertaking without mature consideration. I am young; the world is open to me; it is with regret that I part with life. Everybody agrees in this, that if Bismarck were to abdicate, the war, at least the civil war, could still be prevented. If he is put aside, the same result may be brought about. It is surely worth an effort, to save many lives by the sacrifice of two."

These were the last words ever received from this young man; for Bismarck will not permit even the tears of a mother, still fresh, to win from his clutch the final adieu of her son.

We all know how it ended. The iron-clad breast was saved, and the patriot lay dead at the feet of Germany's despot. By the light of torches, at midnight, far away in a crypt, in utter silence, the young man who gave his life for his fatherland is buried. Bismarck has the triumph of plunging Europe into war. But no genuine deed is utterly powerless in this world. The blow that the youth aimed was the blow of all Germany; and Germany even now kisses this picture of the young hero with tears, whilst it execrates the tyrant with his heritage of triumphant wrong.

Let none here speak of the great sin of assassination; let that be left as the fiction of despots. Whether war be wrong, is another question; but whether it be the collision of armies, or the collision between John Brown with a score of comrades and slavery, or a youth encountering the throne of Germany with a pistol—it is all the same; it is war. Tyrants hate assassination of despots because it is the only method by which the weak can equalize themselves with the strong. They who trample on law, too plead the law! Those who slaughter thousands too prate against regicide! I do not approve of the method in many cases; but I do believe that the deed of Ferdinand Blind was inspired by the noblest feeling; that it was a deed of pure self-sacrifice by a young man for whom life had unusual charms, (for he had evidently determined in any event that he himself must die,) and that it was therefore as genuine and necessary as any flash of the lightning which he saw on the horizon when the purpose arose in his mind, and, amid the storm, he became calm.

And believing as I do with Wadsworth, that *really* "all virtue doth succeed," I shall hereafter see a certain invisible spirit struggling with Count Bismarck; a spirit which cannot be resisted by any coat of mail; and expects the seeming failure of Ferdinand Blind to be proved in the end the sheath of a more consummate success. War and violence are only tolerable, only true, when they thus leap from earnest human hearts, thrusting aside the human will, scorning precedents; each are the thunderbolts of God; they do not miss their aim.

AMERIC
AND I
NOTIC
sion, t
July,
We h
contains
work in
a variety
The
gh of J
Associa
On th
he has
Toles, o
Rev. G.
nople, F
with the
The e
the labor
great ex
and bur
The
Home
of this
for a gro
Nearl
various
scribed
gratifyin
There
the Stat
the esta
read and
the Con
On th
ter, Mas
will also
"The
Second
the 9th
or the p
the elec
the elec
printing
matters
ponding
lect; p
pamphl
The
in othe
that we

BOOK NOTICES.

AMERICAN SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION. CONSTITUTION, ADDRESSES, AND LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF SOCIAL SCIENCE, with the questions proposed for Discussion, to which are added, Minutes of the Transactions of the Association. July, 1866.

We have received this pamphlet, which consists of sixty-four pages, and contains matter of great interest. It is a record of the first year's valuable work in which this Association has engaged. The discussions turn upon a variety of topics, and in some instances are very able.

The Reform School Conference, which met at the State House on the 9th of June, and kept in session three days, was called by the American Association, and some account of its proceedings are here given.

On the first day papers were read by F. B. Sanborn, of Concord, (which he has furnished us for publication), B. J. Butts, of Hopedale, Rev. Mr. Toles, of Boston, and by Rev. C. F. Barnard, who read a paper written by Rev. G. W. Holls, Superintendent of the Orphan's Farm School at Zeligople, Penn. His subject was, *The European Reformatories, as compared with those of America.*

The essay by Mr. Butts, was upon "Vagrancy and its Causes," in which the labor question was largely concerned, the assumption being that, to a great extent, vagrancy resulted from the unequal distribution of the fruits and burdens of labor.

The essay by Rev. Mr. Toles, Superintendent of the Baldwin Place Home for little Wanderers, was upon the object and the beneficial results of this institution. So successful had it been that homes could be found for a greater number of children than the House could supply.

Nearly five hundred children had been received in the Home, of all the various classes which furnish young vagrants, and which Mr. Toles described in detail. The success of this new establishment had been very gratifying.

There was, on the second day, a general attendance of the Conference at the State Reform School, in Westborough, where, after an examination of the establishment, a session was held in the chapel, and different papers read and discussed, a report of which is to appear in the printed report of the Conference.

On the third day the delegates visited the Industrial School at Lancaster, Mass. A report of this visit, the papers read, and of the discussions, will also appear in the report of the Conference.

"The Third General Meeting of the Association, which will include the *Second Annual Meeting*, will be held in New Haven, Conn., on TUESDAY, the 9th of OCTOBER, 1866, at 10, A. M. Notice of papers to be presented, or the papers themselves, should be sent to the Recording Secretary before the first of October. The first business on Wednesday, the 10th, will be the election of officers for the year, after which provision will be made for printing the *Transactions* for 1865-6, for the annual assessment, and other matters of business. All members, whether Regular, Honorary or Corresponding, are invited to communicate papers on such topics as they may select; preference being given to those indicated on pages 18-24 of this pamphlet."

The paper by Mr. Sanborn, elsewhere printed, though partially reported in other papers, will prove, we think, of so much interest to our readers, that we are glad to be able to furnish it for them in full.

SEXUAL PHYSIOLOGY: A Scientific and popular Exposition of the Fundamental Problems in Sociology. By R. I. TRALL, M. D. New York and London: 1866. pp. xlv. 312.

We agree with the writer of this volume, that a great deal of social misery, and much ill health, disgust and infelicity in matrimony, result from the popular ignorance on matters that relate to sex and to the conception of children. The passions of men need to be restrained by knowledge, if they cannot be rebuked by the presence of moral and religious feeling. If American women are notoriously careless about their health, are lovers of in-door life, and dislike to make their dress and customs conform to a capricious climate, it is certain that the young men err most profoundly when they import their reckless temper into the estate of marriage, and subject the unconscious woman to something worse than her own delicate health. We have no objection to see the subject stated plainly in clear type. American women have too many children, and have them too often when every physical condition imperatively calls for repose and immunity. The experience of life teaches us that woman should have the control of her own person; for the soundness and happiness of her children are involved in it. We like to see the fact put plainly before the consideration of men, to make an appeal to them against their indiscriminate and uncalculating interference with the laws of nature. No further details are desirable beyond those which may impress men with the advantages of that delicate regard for woman by which she gains repose, long periods of immunity that nourish the health, sweetness, dignity and future comfort of the household. In this respect we welcome the plain talking that is to be found in many pages of this volume.

But we think it is too full of purely scientific details. Men may not shrink from reading them; perhaps it is better that everything knowable on this point should be known by men. But we would not have a daughter of ours find the book, nor catch a glimpse of some of the wood-cuts, which, we must say, are too liberal, and entirely superfluous. From a delicate motive the volume appears to lack delicacy; and we think that all the important matter in it, touching upon the relations of the sexes, might take some nobler strain, separated from many of the physical explanations.

How to do such a thing well, is certainly a great problem. How to tell the young all the needful truth without violation of a reserve which is not all mere ignorance, and not all a mere occasion for abuses of the fancy; how to keep knowledge innocent — that is the question for a prurient and eager age. Which shall we prefer, an eruption of all the secrets of the physician into print and wood-cuts, every counter strewn with them, and boys and girls invited to premature fancies — or the old ignorance of sacred laws of the sexual relation, the old subjection of woman to the slavery of superfluous child-bearing, with all the disgust, alienation, hidden chagrin, foundered health and spirits, which that brings? We think the alternative lies in telling the truth with greater economy of details. We would say, with greater modesty; but the writer of this volume is conscious only of a pure motive, and is earnestly moved by considerations of humanity.

American parents are very much to blame. *They* are the proper authorities upon these vital points of the happiness and dignity of their children. They can communicate in the wisest and clearest way all that their own mistakes, their own information, their own folly or wisdom has furnished to their middle age. Their reticence upon this matter is the absurdest thing we know about American domestic life. Not absurd, merely, but criminal and palpably contradictory of some of the purest and sanest objects of a home, and fruitful in unhappy marriages. The reform must begin in the sweet privacy of every house, where sons and daughters are growing in the strength and beauty which future marriages should reverence and preserve.

J. W.

anda-
and

mis-
from
ption
age, if
. If
rs of
ca-
when
object
alth.
mer-
very
spe-
own
in it.
nake
rfer-
rond
gard
our-
In
ages

not
e on
er of
ich,
mo-
por-
ome

tell
not
cy;
and
the
and
cred
y of
rin,
tive
say,
of a

hor-
ren.
own
d to
hing
inal
of a
the
the
rve.
w.